

1 TODD KIM, Assistant Attorney General
2 S. JAY GOVINDAN, Acting Chief
3 MEREDITH L. FLAX, Assistant Chief
4 KAITLYN POIRIER, Trial Attorney (TN Bar # 034394)
5 U.S. Department of Justice
6 Environment & Natural Resources Division
7 Wildlife & Marine Resources Section
8 Ben Franklin Station, P.O. Box 7611
9 Washington, D.C. 20044-7611
10 Telephone: (202) 598-1050
11 Facsimile: (202) 305-0275
12 Email: kaitlyn.poirier@usdoj.gov

13 Attorneys for Federal Defendants

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY,

Plaintiff,

v.

GINA RAIMONDO, in her official capacity as
Secretary of Commerce; and NATIONAL
MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:22-cv-00117-JD

**FEDERAL DEFENDANTS' CROSS-
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
AND OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Hearing: December 1, 2022
Time: 10:00 AM
Judge: James Donato

NOTICE OF MOTION

Please take notice that on December 1, 2022, at 10:00 AM, or as soon thereafter as the parties may be heard, Federal Defendants Gina Raimondo, in her official capacity as Secretary of Commerce, and the National Marine Fisheries Service will bring for hearing their Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment and Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment.

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 and Civil Local Rule 7, Federal Defendants cross-move for summary judgment on all of the claims in Plaintiff's Complaint, ECF 1. Federal

1 Defendants are entitled to summary judgment because Plaintiff's Endangered Species Act claims
2 are time-barred under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act and,
3 even if the claims were justiciable, the National Marine Fisheries Service complied with the
4 Endangered Species Act's requirements in issuing its biological opinion. The National Marine
5 Fisheries Service also complied with all of its legal requirements when issuing an incidental take
6 permit pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Federal Defendants' Cross-Motion is based
7 on the accompanying memorandum, the administrative record, all other matters of which the Court
8 may take judicial notice, and any argument or evidence that may be presented to or considered by
9 the Court prior to its ruling.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	LEGAL BACKGROUND	1
3	I. The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act	1
4	II. The Endangered Species Act.....	2
5	III. The Marine Mammal Protection Act	3
6	FACTUAL BACKGROUND	4
7	STANDARD OF REVIEW	6
8	ARGUMENT	7
9	I. Plaintiff's ESA Claims are Time-Barred.....	7
10	II. NMFS Complied with the ESA.	9
11	A. NMFS Considered the Threat of Ship Strikes to Humpback Whales	9
12	B. NMFS Examined All Relevant Factors Before Making its No Jeopardy	
13	Conclusion	10
14	C. The Reasonable and Prudent Measures in the ITS Comply with	
15	ESA Regulations	13
16	D. NMFS Considered the Best Available Science Regarding Whale Populations	15
17	III. NMFS Appropriately Relied on the BiOp.....	16
18	IV. NMFS Complied with the MMPA.....	17
19	A. NMFS Considered Human-Caused M/SI from All Sources when Making its	
20	Negligible Impact Determination.....	18
21	B. NMFS is Not Required to Implement a Take Reduction Plan if there is	
22	Insufficient Funding Available.	22
23	C. NMFS Reasonably Analyzed the CA/OR/WA Stock of Humpback Whales in its	
24	Negligible Impact Determination.....	23
25	V. No Remedy is Necessary.....	25
26	CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	PAGE
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	19
<i>Bowman Transp., Inc. v. Ark.-Best Freight Sys., Inc.</i> , 419 U.S. 281 (1974)	6
<i>Cal. Cmtys. Against Toxics v. EPA</i> , 699 F.3d 989 (9th Cir. 2012)	25
<i>Center for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Bureau of Land Management</i> , 422 F. Supp. 2d 1115 (N.D. Cal. 2006)	14, 15
<i>City of Tacoma v. FERC</i> , 460 F.3d 53 (D.C. Cir. 2006)	17
<i>Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Haaland</i> , 998 F.3d 1061 (9th Cir. 2021)	20
<i>Hui Kohola I Kohola v. NMFS</i> , 669 F. Supp. 2d 1182 (D. Haw. 2009)	22
<i>Idaho Farm Bureau Fed'n v. Babbitt</i> , 58 F.3d 1392 (9th Cir. 1995)	25
<i>Lands Council v. Powell</i> , 395 F.3d 1019 (9th Cir. 2005)	23
<i>Life Techs. Corp. v. Promega Corp.</i> , 580 U.S. 140 (2017)	20
<i>Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i> , 463 U.S. 29 (1983)	6
<i>N. Carolina Fisheries Ass'n, Inc. v. Gutierrez</i> , 550 F.3d 16 (D.C. Cir. 2008)	1
<i>Nat'l Wildlife Fed'n v. NMFS</i> , 524 F.3d 917 (9th Cir. 2008)	13

1	<i>Nat. Res. Def. Council v. Evans,</i>	
2	364 F. Supp. 2d 1083 (N.D. Cal. 2003)	6
3	<i>Newton v. American Debit Services, Inc.,</i>	
4	75 F. Supp. 2d 1083 (N.D. Cal. 2014).....	23
5	<i>Norbird Fisheries v. NMFS,</i>	
6	112 F.3d 414 (9th Cir. 1997)	2
7	<i>Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians v. U.S. Dep’t of Navy,</i>	
8	898 F.2d 1410 (9th Cir. 1990)	16, 17
9	<i>San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Auth. v. Jewell,</i>	
10	747 F.3d 581 (9th Cir. 2014)	6, 10
11	<i>Skidmore v. Swift & Co.,</i>	
12	323 U.S. 134 (1944).....	20
13	<i>Strahan v. Linnon,</i>	
14	967 F. Supp. 581 (D. Mass. 1997)	22
15	<i>Turtle Island Restoration Network v. U.S. Dep’t of Com.,</i>	
16	438 F.3d 937 (9th Cir. 2006)	7
17	<i>Turtle Island Restoration Network v. U.S. Dep’t of Com.,</i>	
18	878 F.3d 725 (9th Cir. 2017)	13

STATUTES

19	1 U.S.C. § 1.....	20
20	5 U.S.C. § 706.....	6
21	16 U.S.C. § 1361(a)(2).....	21
22	16 U.S.C. § 1361(2).....	3
23	16 U.S.C. § 1362(11).....	24
24	16 U.S.C. § 1362(13)	3
25	16 U.S.C. § 1371(a)(5)(E)	18
	16 U.S.C. § 1371(a)(5)(E)(i)	3, 18, 21, 22, 24

1	16 U.S.C. § 1371(a)(5)(E)(ii)	20
2	16 U.S.C. § 1372	3
3	16 U.S.C. § 1387(d)	3, 21, 22
4	16 U.S.C. § 1387(f)(3)	3, 22
5	16 U.S.C. § 1531(b)	2
6	16 U.S.C. § 1532(19)	2
7	16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2)	2, 16
8	16 U.S.C. § 1536(b)(4)	2
9	16 U.S.C. § 1536(b)(4)(iv)	3
10	16 U.S.C. § 1801(a)(6)	1
11	16 U.S.C. § 1836	24
12	16 U.S.C. § 1853(a)(1)	2
13	16 U.S.C. § 1855(f)	2, 6

RULES

15	Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2)	19
----	-------------------------------	----

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

17	50 C.F.R. § 216.103	18
18	50 C.F.R. § 401.14(i)(1)	13
19	50 C.F.R. § 402.02	11
20	50 C.F.R. § 402.13-402.14	2
21	50 C.F.R. § 402.14(a)-(b)(1)	2
22	50 C.F.R. § 402.14(g)-(h)	2
23	50 C.F.R. § 402.14(i)(2)	14
24	50 C.F.R. § 660.211	4

1 **OTHER SOURCES**

35 Fed. Reg. 13,319.....	4
66 Fed. Reg. 41152 (August 7, 2001)	4
81 Fed. Reg. 62,259 (Sep. 8, 2016).....	4, 16
85 Fed. Reg. 79,880 (Dec. 11, 2020)	5
86 Fed. Reg. 3,028 (Jan. 14, 2021)	5, 16, 19, 22
86 Fed. Reg. 58,641 (Nov. 5, 2021).....	24
86 Fed. Reg. 69,627 (Dec. 8, 2021)	6, 22, 24

TABLE OF ACRONYMS

APA	Administrative Procedure Act
BiOp	Biological Opinion
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FMP	Fishery Management Plan
ITS	Incidental Take Statement
MSA	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
MMPA	Marine Mammal Protection Act
M/SI	Mortalities or Serious Injuries
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NIT _T	negligible impact threshold from all sources
NIT _S	negligible impact threshold for a single fishery
RPM	Reasonable and Prudent Measure

1

2 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

3

4

5 INTRODUCTION

6

7 In 2020, the National Marine Fisheries Service (“NMFS”) authorized the groundfish
 8 fishery to continue fishery operations in 2021 and 2022 off the west coast of the United States
 9 pursuant to the agency’s authority under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and
 10 Management Act (“MSA”). But, before doing so, NMFS complied with the Endangered Species
 11 Act (“ESA”) by consulting on the effects of the groundfish fishery on ESA-listed humpback
 12 whales. In the resulting biological opinion (“BiOp”), NMFS concluded that the continued
 13 authorization of the fishery was not likely to jeopardize the existence of humpback whales. Then,
 14 in 2021, NMFS determined that the sablefish pot gear fishery, a subset of the groundfish fishery,
 15 would have a “negligible impact” on humpback whales and issued a Marine Mammal Protection
 16 Act (“MMPA”) permit to the fishery for the incidental take of those whales.

17 Plaintiff presents a variety of arguments that NMFS’s actions in issuing the BiOp and
 18 MMPA permit were unlawful. But, as explained below, Plaintiff’s ESA claims are time-barred
 19 because Plaintiff filed suit more than 30 days after NMFS authorized the fishery under the MSA.
 20 And, even if Plaintiff’s ESA claims were justiciable, the BiOp is rational and based on the best
 21 scientific information available. Similarly, Plaintiff’s claim that the MMPA permit is arbitrary and
 22 violates the plain text of the statute is without merit. For these reasons, the Court should grant
 23 Federal Defendants’ motion for summary judgment.

24

25 LEGAL BACKGROUND

I. The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act

The MSA instituted a national program for the management of fishery resources. 16 U.S.C. §§ 1801(a)(6), 1811(a). To assist in fishery management, the MSA established regional fishery management councils to advise NMFS on management of fisheries. *Id.* § 1852. The Pacific Fishery Management Council (“Council”) advises NMFS on fisheries seaward of Washington, Oregon, and California. *Id.* § 1852(a)(1)(F).

Regulation of fisheries is accomplished through fishery management plans (“FMPs”) and implementing regulations promulgated by NMFS. *See N. Carolina Fisheries Ass’n, Inc. v.*

Gutierrez, 550 F.3d 16, 17 (D.C. Cir. 2008). All FMPs and each implementing regulation must meet both the requirements of the MSA and “other applicable law,” such as the ESA and the MMPA. 16 U.S.C. § 1853(a)(1). The MSA states that “actions that are taken by the Secretary [of Commerce] under regulations which implement” a FMP are subject to judicial review only if petitions are “filed within 30 days after the date on which the regulations are promulgated.” *Id.* § 1855(f). The Ninth Circuit has made clear that this provision of the MSA is jurisdictional. *Norbird Fisheries v. NMFS*, 112 F.3d 414, 416 (9th Cir. 1997).

II. The Endangered Species Act

Congress enacted the ESA “to provide a means whereby the ecosystems upon which endangered species and threatened species depend may be conserved, [and] to provide a program for the conservation of such endangered species and threatened species.” 16 U.S.C. § 1531(b). The ESA defines “species” to include “any subspecies of fish or wildlife or plants, and any distinct population segment of any species of vertebrate fish or wildlife which interbreeds when mature.” *Id.* § 1532(16).

Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA requires Federal agencies (known as an “action agency”) to ensure, in consultation with the expert consulting agencies, that any action they fund, authorize, or carry out “is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification” of designated critical habitat. *Id.* § 1536(a)(2). If the action agency determines its proposed action “may affect” listed species or critical habitat, then it must consult with the appropriate expert “consulting agency.” *See* 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(a)-(b)(1). In this case, NMFS is both the action agency and the consulting agency. If the consulting agency determines the action is “likely to adversely affect” listed species or critical habitat, the agencies must engage in formal consultation. *See id.* § 402.13-402.14. Formal consultation leads to the issuance of a written biological opinion by the consulting agency that assesses the likelihood of jeopardy to the species and destruction or adverse modification of its critical habitat. *Id.* § 402.14(g)-(h).

If the consulting agency concludes that: (1) the proposed action is not likely to jeopardize

1 or adversely modify critical habitat of a listed species but is likely to result in incidental take¹ of a
 2 listed species; and (2) if the listed species is a marine mammal, the taking is authorized pursuant
 3 to the MMPA, it issues an incidental take statement (“ITS”). 16 U.S.C. § 1536(b)(4). An ITS
 4 specifies the impact of the incidental taking on the listed species, establishes reasonable and
 5 prudent measures (“RPMs”) that are necessary or appropriate to minimize the amount or extent of
 6 incidental take, and states the terms and conditions that the action agency must comply with to
 7 implement the RPMs. *Id.* § 1536(b)(4)(C)(i)-(iv). Any take that occurs in compliance with the
 8 terms and conditions of the ITS is exempt from the general take prohibition in Section 9, meaning
 9 that the take is lawful. *Id.* § 1536(b)(4)(C)(iv), (o)(2).

III. The Marine Mammal Protection Act

10 Congress enacted the MMPA to ensure that marine mammals are not “permitted to
 11 diminish beyond the point at which they cease to be a significant functioning element in the
 12 ecosystem of which they are a part.” 16 U.S.C. § 1361(2). Under the MMPA, it is unlawful “to
 13 take any marine mammal” in “waters or on lands under the jurisdiction of the United States” or
 14 “on the high seas.” *id.* § 1372; *see also id.* § 1371(a). In the MMPA, “take” means “to harass, hunt,
 15 capture, or kill, or attempt to harass, hunt, capture, or kill any marine mammal.” *Id.* § 1362(13).

16 The MMPA allows NMFS to issue permits during any period of up to three years to vessels
 17 engaged in commercial fishing operations for the incidental taking of a marine mammal that is
 18 listed as an endangered or threatened species under the ESA. *Id.* § 1371(a)(5)(E)(i). NMFS must
 19 make three determinations before issuing the permit: (1) the incidental mortality and serious injury
 20 (“MS/I”) from commercial fisheries will have a negligible impact on the species; (2) a recovery
 21 plan either has been, or is being developed, for the species pursuant to the ESA; and (3) where
 22 required under 16 U.S.C. § 1387(d), a monitoring program is established, vessels engaged in such
 23 fisheries are registered, and a take reduction plan has been, or is being, developed for the species.
 24 *Id.* Importantly, however, NMFS is not required to implement a take reduction plan if there are
 25 insufficient funds available and other species are higher priority for a take reduction team being

¹ In the ESA, “take” is defined as “to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct.” 16 U.S.C. § 1532(19).

1 developed. *Id.* § 1387(f)(3).

2 FACTUAL BACKGROUND

3 Humpback whales are one of the largest mammals on Earth, reaching a maximum length
 4 of about 52-57 feet and weighing more than 40 tons. BiOp 000106. Humpback whales are found
 5 in all of the world's oceans and are a migratory species, moving between high latitude feeding
 6 grounds in the summer to low latitude breeding areas in the winter. BiOp 000108.

7 NMFS listed humpback whales as an endangered species in 1970. 35 Fed. Reg. 18,319-20
 8 (Dec. 2, 1970). In 2016, NMFS revised the listing status for humpback whales, dividing the
 9 previously globally-listed species into 14 distinct population segments ("DPSs"). 81 Fed. Reg.
 10 62,259 (Sep. 8, 2016). The three DPSs of humpback whales that can be found in waters off the
 11 United States' west coast are: the Central America DPS, the Mexico DPS and the Hawaii DPS.
 12 NMFS has determined that the Central America DPS is endangered, the Mexico DPS is
 13 threatened², and the Hawaii DPS should not be listed. *See id.* For purposes of the MMPA, NMFS
 14 has designated all humpback whales that feed off the west coast of the United States to be the
 15 "CA/OR/WA stock." BiOp 000107. In other words, the CA/OR/WA stock of humpback whales
 16 consists of whales from the Central America, Mexico, and Hawaii DPSs. *Id.* NMFS has estimated
 17 that the minimum number of whales in the CA/OR/WA stock is 4,776 based on data from 2014-
 18 2018. BiOp 000108.

19 The CA/OR/WA stock can interact with numerous fisheries within and outside of United
 20 States' waters, including the groundfish fishery, a year-round fishery that occurs off the coasts of
 21 Washington, Oregon, and California. The fishery includes both recreational and commercial
 22 fishermen who use a variety of gear types to harvest more than 90 species of fish, including
 23 sablefish. BiOp 000093; BiOp 000124. The Council's Groundfish FMP sets the framework for
 24 management of the fishery.³ The Groundfish FMP, and its implementing regulations, authorize
 25 and manage sablefish fisheries that use "fixed gear," which includes "trap" or "pot" gear. 50 C.F.R.

² NMFS has extended the ESA Section 9 prohibition against take to the threatened Mexico DPS. 81 Fed. Reg. at 62,260.

³ The Groundfish FMP is available at <https://www.pcouncil.org/documents/2022/08/pacific-coast-groundfish-fishery-management-plan.pdf/>.

1
2 §§ 660.211, 600.10. Within the groundfish fishery, there are four distinct sectors that target
3 sablefish either with trawl gear or fixed gear. What is referred to as the “sablefish pot gear fishery”
4 includes vessels fishing with pot/trap gear in all four sectors.

5 Rules governing pot fisheries have been in regulation for decades, subject to periodic
6 program revisions. *See, e.g.*, 66 Fed. Reg. 41,152 (Aug. 7, 2001). Subsequent rulemakings set the
7 specific amount of fishing allowed (known as “specifications”) and the terms under which the
8 fishing may occur (known as “management measures”). Under the framework established by the
9 Groundfish FMP, specifications and management measures are developed and promulgated by
10 NMFS biennially. *See* Groundfish FMP, at 49-50. The most recent biennial specifications
11 implementing the Groundfish FMP were last promulgated on December 11, 2020. 85 Fed. Reg.
12 79,880 (Dec. 11, 2020).

13 Humpback whales can become entangled in fishing gear used in the sablefish pot gear
14 fishery. BiOp 000124-25. A whale’s entanglement in fishing gear can lead to M/SI. Pacific Coast
15 sablefish pot gear fisheries are listed as Category II fisheries under the MMPA (indicating that
16 they occasionally interact with marine mammals), due to incidental M/SI to the CA/OR/WA stock
17 of humpback whales. *See* 86 Fed. Reg. 3,028 (Jan. 14, 2021). All other Pacific Coast groundfish
18 fisheries are listed as Category III, indicating a remote likelihood of M/SI or no known incidental
19 M/SI of marine mammals. *Id.*

20 In the BiOp, NMFS determined that the annual maximum number of humpback whales in
21 the CA/OR/WA stock that could become entangled in the sablefish pot gear fishery is 3.87. BiOp
22 000136. NMFS anticipates that the annual maximum number of whales in the threatened Mexico
23 DPS and endangered Central America DPS that could become entangled is 2.23 and 1.39,
24 respectively.⁴ BiOp 000137. Because not all entanglements result in M/SI, NMFS has also
25 estimated the M/SI that could be expected to occur due to the sablefish pot gear fishery. BiOp
000142. NMFS expects that, during any one year, up to three Mexico DPS whales (rounding up
from 2.09) and two Central America DPS whales (rounding up from 1.25) may be killed or

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
55310
55311
55312
55313
55314
55315
55316
55317
55318
55319
55320
55321
55322
55323
55324
55325
55326
55327
55328
55329
55330
55331
55332
55333
55334
55335
55336
55337
55338
55339
55340
55341
55342
55343
55344
55345
55346
55347
55348
55349
55350
55351
55352
55353
55354
55355
55356
55357
55358
55359
55360
55361
55362
55363
55364
55365
55366
55367
55368
55369
55370
55371
55372
55373
55374
55375
55376
55377
55378
55379
55380
55381
55382
55383
55384
55385
55386
55387
55388
55389
55390
55391
55392
55393
55394
55395
55396
55397
55398
55399
553100
553101
553102
553103
553104
553105
553106
553107
553108
553109
553110
553111
553112
553113
553114
553115
553116
553117
553118
553119
553120
553121
553122
553123
553124
553125
553126
553127
553128
553129
553130
553131
553132
553133
553134
553135
553136
553137
553138
553139
553140
553141
553142
553143
553144
553145
553146
553147
553148
553149
553150
553151
553152
553153
553154
553155
553156
553157
553158
553159
553160
553161
553162
553163
553164
553165
553166
553167
553168
553169
553170
553171
553172
553173
553174
553175
553176
553177
553178
553179
553180
553181
553182
553183
553184
553185
553186
553187
553188
553189
553190
553191
553192
553193
553194
553195
553196
553197
553198
553199
553200
553201
553202
553203
553204
553205
553206
553207
553208
553209
553210
553211
553212
553213
553214
553215
553216
553217
553218
553219
553220
553221
553222
553223
553224
553225
553226
553227
553228
553229
553230
553231
553232
553233
553234
553235
553236
553237
553238
553239
553240
553241
553242
553243
553244
553245
553246
553247
553248
553249
553250
553251
553252
553253
553254
553255
553256
553257
553258
553259
553260
553261
553262
553263
553264
553265
553266
553267
553268
553269
553270
553271
553272
553273
553274
553275
553276
553277
553278
553279
553280
553281
553282
553283
553284
553285
553286
553287
553288
553289
553290
553291
553292
553293
553294
553295
553296
553297
553298
553299
553300
553301
553302
553303
553304
553305
553306
553307
553308
553309
553310
553311
553312
553313
553314
553315
553316
553317
553318
553319
553320
553321
553322
553323
553324
553325
553326
553327
553328
553329
553330
553331
553332
553333
553334
553335
553336
553337
553338
553339
553340
553341
553342
553343
553344
553345
553346
553347
553348
553349
553350
553351
553352
553353
553354
553355
553356
553357
553358
553359
553360
553361
553362
553363
553364
553365
553366
553367
553368
553369
553370
553371
553372
553373
553374
553375
553376
553377
553378
553379
553380
553381
553382
553383
553384
553385
553386
553387
553388
553389
553390
553391
553392
553393
553394
553395
553396
553397
553398
553399
553400
553401
553402
553403
553404
553405
553406
553407
553408
553409
553410
553411
553412
553413
553414
553415
553416
553417
553418
553419
553420
553421
553422
553423
553424
553425
553426
553427
553428
553429
553430
553431
553432
553433
553434
553435
553436
553437
553438
553439
553440
553441
553442
553443
553444
553445
553446
553447
553448
553449
553450
553451
553452
553453
553454
553455
553456
553457
553458
553459
553460
553461
553462
553463
553464
553465
553466
553467
553468
553469
553470
553471
553472
553473
553474
553475
553476
553477
553478
553479
553480
553481
553482
553483
553484
553485
553486
553487
553488
553489
553490
553491
553492
553493
553494
553495
553496
553497
553498
553499
553500
553501
553502
553503
553504
553505
553506
553507
553508
553509
553510
553511
553512
553513
553514
553515
553516
553517
553518
553519
553520
553521
553522
553523
553524
553525
553526
553527
553528
553529
553530
553531
553532
553533
553534
553535
553536
553537
553538
553539
553540
553541
553542
553543
553544
553545
553546
553547
553548
553549
553550
553551
553552
553553
553554
553555
553556
553557
553558
553559
553560
553561
553562
553563
553564
553565
553566
553567
553568
553569
553570
553571
553572
553573
553574
553575
553576
553577
553578
553579
553580
553581
553582
553583
553584
553585
553586
553587
553588
553589
553590
553591
553592
553593
553594
553595
553596
553597
553598
553599
553600
553601
553602
553603
553604
553605
553606
553607
553608
553609
553610
553611
553612
553613
553614
553615
553616
553617
553618
553619
553620
553621
553622
553623
553624
553625
553626
553627
553628
553629
553630
553631
553632
553633
553634
553635
553636
553637
553638
553639
553640
553641
553642
553643
553644
553645
553646
553647
553648
553649
553650
553651
553652
553653
553654
553655
553656
553657
553658
553659
553660
553661
553662
553663
553664
553665
553666
553667
553668
553669
553670
553671
553672
553673
553674
553675
553676
553677
553678
553679
553680
553681
553682
553683
553684
553685
553686
553687
553688
553689
553690
553691
553692
553693
553694
553695
553696
553697
553698
553699
553700
553701
553702
553703
553704
553705
553706
553707
553708
553709
553710
553711
553712
553713
553714
553715
553716
553717
553718
553719
553720
553721
553722
553723
553724
553725
553726
553727
553728
553729
553730
553731
553732
553733
553734
553735
553736
553737
553738
553739
5537340
5537341
5537342
5537343
5537344
5537345
5537346
5537347
5537348
5537349
55373410
55373411
55373412
55373413
55373414
55373415
55373416
55373417
55373418
55373419
55373420
55373421
55373422
55373423
55373424
55373425
55373426
55373427
55373428
55373429
55373430
55373431
55373432
55373433
55373434
55373435
55373436
55373437
55373438
55373439
55373440
55373441
55373442
55373443
55373444
55373445
55373446
55373447
55373448
55373449
55373450
55373451
55373452
55373453
55373454
55373455
55373456
55373457
55373458
55373459
55373460
55373461
55373462
55373463
55373464
55373465
55373466
55373467
55373468
55373469
55373470
55373471
55373472
55373473
55373474
55373475
55373476
55373477
55373478
55373479
55373480
55373481
55373482
55373483
55373484
55373485
55373486
55373487
55373488
55373489
55373490
55373491
55373492
55373493
55373494
55373495
55373496
55373497
55373498
55373499
553734100
553734101
553734102
553734103
553734104
553734105
553734106
553734107
553734108
553734109
553734110
553734111
553734112
553734113
553734114
553734115
553734116
553734117
553734118
553734119
553734120
553734121
553734122
553734123
553734124
553734125
553734126
553734127
553734128
553734129
553734130
553734131
553734132
553734133
553734134
553734135
553734136
553734137
553734138
553734139
553734140
553734141
553734142
553734143
553734144
553734145
553734146
553734147
553734148
553734149
553734150
553734151
553734152
553734153
553734154
553734155
553734156
553734157
553734158
553734159
553734160
553734161
553734162
553734163
553734164
553734165
553734166
553734167
553734168
553734169
553734170
553734171
553734172
553734173
553734174
553734175
553734176
553734177
553734178
553734179
553734180
553734181
553734182
5

1 seriously injured by the sablefish pot gear fishery. *Id.* This represents less than 0.1% of the
 2 population of either DPS. *Id.*

3 In 2012, NMFS completed an ESA consultation on the groundfish fishery's effect on
 4 humpback whales and other listed species. BiOp 000091. In 2018, NMFS reinitiated ESA
 5 consultation on the authorization and continuing operation of the groundfish fishery due to
 6 NMFS's reclassification of humpback whales into 14 different DPSs and the exceedance of the
 7 ITS. BiOp 000092. NMFS completed its reinitiated ESA consultation and issued a BiOp on
 8 October 26, 2020, concluding that the continued operation of the groundfish fishery is not likely
 9 to jeopardize the continued existence of either the Mexico or Central America DPSs of the
 10 humpback whale. BiOp 000146; BiOp 000168. NMFS also issued an ITS, which includes RPMs
 11 and terms and conditions. BiOp 000146-50. NMFS issued the MMPA permit authorizing
 12 incidental take of humpback whales in the sablefish pot gear fishery on December 8, 2021. 86 Fed.
 13 Reg. 69,627 (Dec. 8, 2021).

14 STANDARD OF REVIEW

15 Because the ESA and MMPA do not contain their own standard of review, these claims
 16 are reviewed pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"). *See San Luis & Delta-*
Mendota Water Auth. v. Jewell, 747 F.3d 581, 601 (9th Cir. 2014) (ESA claims); *Nat. Res. Def.*
Council v. Evans, 364 F. Supp. 2d 1083, 1093 (N.D. Cal. 2003) (MMPA claims). Section 706 of
 17 the APA grants a court the power to hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and
 18 conclusions found to be "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in
 19 accordance with law" or "without observance of procedure required by law." 5 U.S.C. § 706. A
 20 decision is only "arbitrary and capricious" if the agency "entirely failed to consider an important
 21 aspect of the problem, offered an explanation for its decision that runs counter to the evidence
 22 before the agency, or is so implausible that it could not be ascribed to a difference in view or the
 23 product of agency expertise." *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463
 24 U.S. 29, 43 (1983). The Court may "uphold a decision of less than ideal clarity if the agency's path
 25 may reasonably be discerned." *Bowman Transp., Inc. v. Ark.-Best Freight Sys., Inc.*, 419 U.S. 281,
 286 (1974).

1

2 ARGUMENT

3

4

I. Plaintiff's ESA Claims are Time-Barred

5

6 Plaintiff's ESA claims are untimely because it filed suit well over 30 days after NMFS
 7 issued the 2020 biennial specifications authorizing the sablefish pot gear fishery. Challenges to
 8 regulations implementing FMPs must be filed within 30 days of the regulations' promulgation. 16
 9 U.S.C. § 1855(f). By establishing a finite limitations period, Congress indicated its intent that any
 10 legal challenge would be quickly resolved, giving fishery participants certainty and allowing them
 11 to make financial commitments with confidence. In this suit, Plaintiff seeks to circumvent this
 12 directive and undermine Congress' intent by avoiding mention of or alleging claims under the
 13 MSA, instead challenging NMFS's authorization and management of the sablefish pot gear fishery
 14 via the ESA—which does not require lawsuits to be brought within 30 days.⁵

15 However, “invocation of the magic words, ‘the Magnuson Act,’ is not a predicate to
 16 application of § 1855(f) if the substance of the challenge is to the regulations themselves.” *Turtle*
 17 *Island Restoration Network v. U.S. Dep’t of Com.*, 438 F.3d 937, 944 (9th Cir. 2006). “To allow
 18 parties to avoid this limitation through manipulation of form—avoiding mention of the [MSA] in
 19 the complaint—while in substance challenging the regulations, would permit parties through
 20 careful pleading to avoid the strict jurisdictional limits imposed by Congress.” *Id.* at 945
 21 (alternations and quotation omitted). Instead, “the decisive question is whether the regulations are
 22 being attacked, not whether the complaint specifically asserts a violation of the Magnuson Act.”
 23 *Id.*

24 While Plaintiff is careful to never mention the MSA in its filings, its artful pleading and
 25 deliberate word choices cannot obscure the fact that it is attempting to use the ESA to challenge
 NMFS's authorization and management of the fishery. The complaint makes repeated references
 to NMFS's “authorization and management” of the sablefish pot gear fishery, including a
 statement that the humpback whale “has been, and is being, taken by the Fisheries Service's
 authorization and management of” the fishery. Complaint, ECF 1 ¶ 59; *see also id.* ¶¶ 8, 135; p.

24

25

⁵ Federal Defendants do not allege that Plaintiff's MMPA claims are similarly time-barred because
 NMFS issued the MMPA permit after publication of the 2020 biennial specifications in the Federal
 Register, unlike the BiOp that NMFS issued before publication of the specifications.

1
2 25. Yet, Plaintiff fails to disclose that the authorization and management takes place through rules
3 promulgated under the MSA. *See generally id.* Plaintiff also fails to identify how and when NMFS
4 authorized the fishery or explain how its lawsuit came within 30 days of that authorization. *See*
generally id.

5 Furthermore, Plaintiff's brief recognizes that the BiOp analyzes the effects of NMFS's
6 continued authorization of the sablefish pot gear fishery on humpback whales. *See Plaintiff's Brief,*
7 ECF 282 at 24 ("As a result of NMFS preparing an unlawful Biological Opinion for authorizing
8 and managing the sablefish pot fishery . . ."); *see also* Cummings Decl., ECF 282-1 ¶ 15 ("The
9 management actions and inactions of NMFS authorizes fishing in a manner that does not
10 adequately protect against the likelihood of additional entanglements of these imperiled animals.").
11 The brief also makes other references to NMFS's authorization and management of the sablefish
12 pot gear fishery, albeit under the cover of its ESA claims. *See Plaintiff's Brief, ECF 282 at 1-2,*
13 18. In addition, Plaintiff makes clear that it is aware that "[t]o manage the pot fishery, NMFS
14 implements the [] Groundfish Fishery Management Plan." Plaintiff's Brief, ECF 282 at 3. Yet
15 once again, Plaintiff does not disclose that implementation of the Groundfish FMP occurs through
16 MSA regulations. Finally, the Plaintiff asks this Court to declare "that the National Marine
17 Fisheries Service's reliance on the Biological Opinion to authorize and manage the WA/OR/CA
18 sablefish pot fishery, including in issuing the Marine Mammal Protection Act Permit, is unlawful."
19 Proposed Order, ECF 282-4 at 2. Plaintiff implies that if it is successful, the sablefish pot gear
20 fishery will have to be closed, an action that, as explained above, would require a modification of
21 groundfish regulations through further action under the MSA. Plaintiff's Brief, ECF 282 at 25
22 (arguing that "vacatur will ensure imperiled humpback whales are protected from entanglements
23 in the pot fishery while the agency undertakes new analyses.").

24 As Plaintiff's filings show, its ESA claims challenge NMFS's authorization and
25 management of the sablefish pot gear fishery and implementation of the Groundfish FMP. That
authorization and management came about as a result of several MSA rulemakings, including the
biennial rule promulgated on December 11, 2020, yet Plaintiff did not file suit until January 9,
2022—more than a year after the final rule and well after expiration of the 30 day statute of

1 limitations. To the extent that Plaintiff argues it is only challenging NMFS's issuance of the BiOp
 2 as a consulting agency, the argument is inconsistent with statements made in its complaint, brief,
 3 and the relief sought. The "authorization and management" of the fishery is derived not from the
 4 BiOp, but from the regulations promulgated under the MSA. Thus, irrespective of how Plaintiff
 5 now couches its claim, it is clearly and expressly seeking to invalidate MSA regulations, including
 6 components of the biennial rule, which NMFS issued pursuant to the MSA. Because any challenge
 7 relating to the BiOp is untimely under the MSA's judicial review provision, Plaintiff's ESA claims
 8 must be dismissed.

II. NMFS Complied with the ESA

9 Even if Plaintiff's claims were not time-barred, they lack merit. Plaintiff argues that
 10 NMFS's BiOp is arbitrary and capricious because: (1) NMFS did not "consider threats to
 11 humpback whales in the environmental baseline and when aggregated with other threats"; (2) the
 12 ITS does not minimize take; and (3) NMFS did not use the best available science because it
 13 considered the Hawaii DPS when discussing humpback whale populations. Plaintiff's Brief, ECF
 14 282 at 16-20. But NMFS reasonably considered threats to humpback whales, including ship
 15 strikes, individually and when aggregated with other threats. NMFS has substantial discretion to
 16 determine if, and what kind of, RPMs are "necessary or appropriate" to minimize take and did so
 17 here. And, NMFS appropriately used the best scientific information available when analyzing
 humpback whale populations.

A. NMFS Considered the Threat of Ship Strikes to Humpback Whales

18 Contrary to Plaintiff's assertions, NMFS reasonably considered the threat of ship strikes in
 19 the environmental baseline. In the environmental baseline section of the BiOp, NMFS first
 20 described the threat of ship strikes to humpback whales generally and to the CA/OR/WA stock of
 21 humpback whales in particular. BiOp 000122. NMFS then examined the most recent available
 22 stock assessment report for humpback whales⁶, which concluded that the annual M/SI of the
 23 CA/OR/WA stock of humpback whales for the years 2013-2017 from observed ship strikes is 2.2

24 ⁶ The CA/OR/WA humpback whale MMPA stock assessment report represents the most current
 25 information and best available science for evaluating human impacts on all humpback whales
 along the west coast, including the two ESA-listed humpback DPSs. See BiOp 001763-002147.

1 per year. *Id.* Lastly, NMFS estimated the threat of ship strikes to each DPS of humpback whales
 2 found within the action area. BiOp 000123 (1.34 total annual M/SI from ship strikes for the Mexico
 3 DPS); BiOp 000124 (0.86 total annual M/SI from ship strikes for the Central America DPS).

4 It is apparent from the above information that NMFS considered ship strikes to humpback
 5 whales in the environmental baseline, which is what the ESA requires. But Plaintiff claims that
 6 NMFS should have considered a model included in the stock assessment report concluding that
 7 there could be an estimated 22 ship strike deaths per year. Plaintiff's Brief, ECF 282 at 18.
 8 However, it is within NMFS's discretion as the scientific experts to choose to rely on observed
 9 data rather than data that has been estimated or extrapolated. *See, e.g., San Luis & Delta-Mendota*
 10 *Water Auth.*, 747 F.3d at 610. Furthermore, as discussed below, NMFS considered that it may have
 11 underestimated the baseline impacts from human activities, which would include ship strikes.
 12 BiOp 000144. And NMFS factored in this underestimation when it made its final conclusions in
 the BiOp. *See* BiOp 000144. Therefore, Plaintiff's argument should be rejected.

13 **B. NMFS Examined All Relevant Factors Before Making its No Jeopardy
 Conclusion**

14 Plaintiff is also mistaken when it contends that “[i]n making its no jeopardy determination,
 15 NMFS nowhere analyzed the effects of the pot fishery when combined with baseline conditions,
 16 cumulative impacts, and the status of the populations.” Plaintiff's Brief, ECF 282 at 17. As
 17 demonstrated below, NMFS “add[ed] the effects of the action (Section 2.5) to the environmental
 18 baseline (Section 2.4) and the cumulative effects (Section 2.6), taking into account the status of
 19 the species (Section 2.2), to formulate the agency's opinion as to whether the proposed action is
 20 likely to reduce appreciably the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of a listed species in
 the wild by reducing its numbers, reproduction, or distribution.” BiOp 000143.

21 First, NMFS examined the status of the species, finding that, based on the best scientific
 22 information available, it is likely that the population of humpback whales off the west coast is
 23 increasing 6-7 percent per year and using this information to estimate the abundance of Central
 24 America and Mexico DPSs. BiOp 000106-14. This growth rate necessarily would account for all
 sources of humpback mortality, including ship strikes.

25 Second, NMFS considered the environmental baseline, which refers to the “condition of

1 the listed species . . . in the action area, without the consequences” caused by the proposed action.
2 BiOp 000120. NMFS noted that a “comprehensive list of general threats to humpback whales and
3 their habitat is detailed” in NMFS’s recovery plan and the most recent status review, and
4 specifically analyzed climate change and other habitat impacts on humpback whales such as
5 pollution and noise. *See* BiOp 000120-21. In addition, NMFS thoroughly discussed human-caused
6 M/SI, including entanglements from commercial fisheries, recreational fisheries, and tribal
7 fisheries, as well as ship strikes. BiOp 000121-24.

8 Third, NMFS analyzed effects of the specific proposed action: the continued authorization
9 of the groundfish fishery through implementation of the Groundfish FMP and implementing
10 regulations. BiOp 000124. While possible impacts from the fishery include “collisions with fishing
11 vessels, or exposure to pollution or marine debris . . . the available information does not suggest
12 that any of these additional factors are affecting ESA-listed humpback whales as a result of the
13 continued operation” of the fishery. BiOp 000125. Therefore, NMFS focused its analysis on
14 entanglements. BiOp 000125-42.

15 Fourth, NMFS considered cumulative effects, “those effects of future state or private
16 activities, not involving Federal activities, that are reasonably certain to occur within the action
17 area.” BiOp 000143; 50 C.F.R. § 402.02. NMFS determined that “[s]ome continuing non-Federal
18 activities are reasonably certain to contribute to climate effects [i.e., climate change] within the
19 action area,” but did not identify any other activities that meet the definition of cumulative effects.
20 *See* BiOp 000143.

21 Having completed this analysis, NMFS moved on to the penultimate step in determining
22 whether a proposed action is likely to jeopardize listed species: adding the environmental baseline
23 to the effects of the action and cumulative effects. BiOp 000143-46. Because NMFS could not
24 identify any activities that meet the definition of cumulative effects beyond those activities
25 described in the environmental baseline, the agency only added the environmental baseline to the
effects of the action. *See id.* As demonstrated by the following tables from the BiOp, NMFS added
the M/SI from the environmental baseline to the effects of the groundfish fishery for both the
Central America and Mexico DPSs:

1
2 Analysis for Mexico DPS (BiOp 000145)

Source of take	M/SI
Environmental Baseline average annual impact (Section 2.4.1)	13.63
PCGF – One-year maximum (Section 2.5.5)	2.05
PCGF – Maximum five-year running average (Section 2.5.5)	1.44
Total Annual Impact to DPS (one-year maximum plus the baseline)	15.68

7 Analysis for Central America DPS (BiOp 000146)

Source of take	Total Annual M/SI
Environmental Baseline average annual impact (Section 2.4.2)	8.72
PCGF – One-year maximum (Section 2.5.5)	1.28
PCGF – Maximum five-year running average (Section 2.5.5)	0.90
Total Annual Impact to DPS (one-year maximum plus the baseline)	10.00

12 Finally, NMFS applied this information to the status of the species, concluding that the
13 annual **maximum impact** for the Mexico DPS would be 0.23% of the population (rounding up,
14 16 whales out of 6,724). BiOp 000144. The annual **maximum impact** for the Central America
15 DPS would be 0.53% of the population (10 whales out of 1,876). BiOp 000145. NMFS recognized
16 that the environmental baseline impacts, including ship strikes, from human activities “may be
17 underestimated to some degree.” BiOp 000144. However, because the proposed action is likely to
18 impact significantly less than 1% of each DPS, the effects of the proposed action represent only
19 an estimated 10% (or less) of the total M/SI for each DPS, and the population is likely increasing,
20 “it does not appear that current levels of impact from the PCGF fishery, in addition to the current
21 levels of other impacts that are anticipated to continue to occur, is likely to prohibit continued
22 population growth toward recovery” of the Mexico and Central America DPSs. BiOp 000145-46.
23 Based on all of this data, NMFS reasonably concluded that the continued authorization of the
24 groundfish fishery is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of either the Mexico or
25 Central America DPS. BiOp 000146.

24 Despite Plaintiff’s assertions to the contrary, the BiOp shows that NMFS did indeed
25 analyze the effects of the groundfish fishery combined with the baseline conditions in the context

1 of the status of the species. Plaintiff attempts to muddy the water by citing to several cases that are
 2 inapposite. In *Turtle Island Restoration Network*, the agency premised its no jeopardy conclusion
 3 on the fact that the effects on the species would be minimal when compared to other threats, even
 4 though “any level of take and mortality can have an adverse effect on the overlying population.”
 5 *Turtle Island Restoration Network v. U.S. Dep’t of Commerce*, 878 F.3d 725, 738 (9th Cir. 2017);
 6 *see also Nat’l Wildlife Fed’n v. NMFS*, 524 F.3d 917, 930 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that an agency
 7 may not take an action that causes additional harm if baseline conditions already jeopardize a
 8 species). But here, while NMFS did compare the M/SI from the groundfish fishery relative to other
 9 sources of human-caused M/SI to understand the impacts of the fishery on ESA-listed humpback
 10 whales, its final conclusion rests on the impact of the fishery in addition to the environmental
 11 baseline. *See* BiOp 000144-46. NMFS reasonably considered that, even if the agency had
 12 underestimated the environmental baseline impacts from human-caused M/SI, the groundfish
 13 fishery will account for a small fraction of the total amount of human-caused M/SI. BiOp 000144.
 14 However, in making its no-jeopardy determination NMFS evaluated the status of the species and
 15 the level of impact from the groundfish fishery in addition to other impacts. BiOp 000144-45. This
 16 is squarely in-line with NMFS’s ESA obligations. For these reasons, NMFS’s qualitative and
 17 quantitative decision that the groundfish fishery is not likely to cause jeopardy is reasonable and
 18 should be upheld.

19 **C. The Reasonable and Prudent Measures in the ITS Comply with the
 20 ESA**

21 Plaintiff claims that NMFS “must” minimize the impact of incidental take under the ESA
 22 regulations and that the ITS “fails to include measures to minimize the impact of humpback whale
 23 entanglements from the [sablefish] pot [gear] fishery” and Plaintiff’s Brief, ECF 282 at 18-19.
 24 Plaintiff is wrong on both the law and the facts.

25 As for the law, the ESA regulations state that an ITS needs to, among other things: (1) specify those RPMs that NMFS “considers necessary or appropriate to minimize” the impact of incidental take; (2) in the case of marine mammals, specify those measures that are necessary to comply with the MMPA; and (3) sets forth the terms and conditions that must be complied with to implement those measures. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(b)(4)(C). Pursuant this statutory language, the

1 agency has substantial discretion to determine what RPMs to specify. If NMFS does not believe
 2 RPMs are “necessary or appropriate to minimize” the impact of incidental take, NMFS does not
 3 have to include them in an ITS at all. *See id.*

4 Plaintiff is also wrong on the facts. NMFS did in fact include RPMs that the agency felt
 5 were “necessary or appropriate” to minimize take. BiOp 000148-49. NMFS specified that
 6 monitoring should occur to “ensure compliance with the regulatory and conservation measures
 7 included in the proposed action and the identified amount or extent of incidental take, including
 8 collection and evaluation of data on the capture, injury and mortality of humpback whales.” *Id.*
 9 Plaintiff tries to fault NMFS because the 2012 BiOp had additional RPMs that were not included
 10 in the 2020 BiOp. Plaintiff’s Brief, ECF 282 at 19. What Plaintiff has knowledge of, but does not
 11 mention, is that an RPM from the 2012 BiOp—the formation of a the Groundfish Endangered
 12 Species Work Group—is still in effect. *See* Complaint, ECF 1 ¶ 117; ER 00108-112. In fact, the
 13 Group met in June 2021 and discussed potential conservation measures for humpback whales—
 14 after the most recent BiOp was issued.⁷ *Id.* Term and Condition 2 from the ITS in the 2020 BiOp
 15 specifically requires that NMFS review the Terms of Reference for the Group, clearing indicating
 16 that NMFS is aware the Group is still in effect. BiOp 000149.

17 While Plaintiff scoffs at the substance of the current RPM, and ignores the previous RPM
 18 that is still in effect, it does not offer up any alternative measures that are implementable. Nor
 19 could it. The regulations explain that RPMs, along with the terms and conditions that implement
 20 them, “cannot alter the basic design, location, scope, duration, or timing of the action and may
 21 involve only minor changes.” 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(i)(2). In NMFS’s judgment as the expert agency,
 22 the monitoring in the present ITS, along with the continued operation of the Group, are those RPMs
 23 “necessary or appropriate” to minimize take and do not run afoul of the minor change rule.
 24 Plaintiff’s argument fails to undermine the substantial discretion and deference owed the agency
 25 for such determinations.

26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 1010
 1011
 1012
 1013
 1014
 1015
 1016
 1017
 1018
 1019
 1020
 1021
 1022
 1023
 1024
 1025
 1026
 1027
 1028
 1029
 1030
 1031
 1032
 1033
 1034
 1035
 1036
 1037
 1038
 1039
 1040
 1041
 1042
 1043
 1044
 1045
 1046
 1047
 1048
 1049
 1050
 1051
 1052
 1053
 1054
 1055
 1056
 1057
 1058
 1059
 1060
 1061
 1062
 1063
 1064
 1065
 1066
 1067
 1068
 1069
 1070
 1071
 1072
 1073
 1074
 1075
 1076
 1077
 1078
 1079
 1080
 1081
 1082
 1083
 1084
 1085
 1086
 1087
 1088
 1089
 1090
 1091
 1092
 1093
 1094
 1095
 1096
 1097
 1098
 1099
 1100
 1101
 1102
 1103
 1104
 1105
 1106
 1107
 1108
 1109
 1110
 1111
 1112
 1113
 1114
 1115
 1116
 1117
 1118
 1119
 1120
 1121
 1122
 1123
 1124
 1125
 1126
 1127
 1128
 1129
 1130
 1131
 1132
 1133
 1134
 1135
 1136
 1137
 1138
 1139
 1140
 1141
 1142
 1143
 1144
 1145
 1146
 1147
 1148
 1149
 1150
 1151
 1152
 1153
 1154
 1155
 1156
 1157
 1158
 1159
 1160
 1161
 1162
 1163
 1164
 1165
 1166
 1167
 1168
 1169
 1170
 1171
 1172
 1173
 1174
 1175
 1176
 1177
 1178
 1179
 1180
 1181
 1182
 1183
 1184
 1185
 1186
 1187
 1188
 1189
 1190
 1191
 1192
 1193
 1194
 1195
 1196
 1197
 1198
 1199
 1200
 1201
 1202
 1203
 1204
 1205
 1206
 1207
 1208
 1209
 1210
 1211
 1212
 1213
 1214
 1215
 1216
 1217
 1218
 1219
 1220
 1221
 1222
 1223
 1224
 1225
 1226
 1227
 1228
 1229
 1230
 1231
 1232
 1233
 1234
 1235
 1236
 1237
 1238
 1239
 12310
 12311
 12312
 12313
 12314
 12315
 12316
 12317
 12318
 12319
 12320
 12321
 12322
 12323
 12324
 12325
 12326
 12327
 12328
 12329
 12330
 12331
 12332
 12333
 12334
 12335
 12336
 12337
 12338
 12339
 12340
 12341
 12342
 12343
 12344
 12345
 12346
 12347
 12348
 12349
 12350
 12351
 12352
 12353
 12354
 12355
 12356
 12357
 12358
 12359
 12360
 12361
 12362
 12363
 12364
 12365
 12366
 12367
 12368
 12369
 12370
 12371
 12372
 12373
 12374
 12375
 12376
 12377
 12378
 12379
 12380
 12381
 12382
 12383
 12384
 12385
 12386
 12387
 12388
 12389
 12390
 12391
 12392
 12393
 12394
 12395
 12396
 12397
 12398
 12399
 123100
 123101
 123102
 123103
 123104
 123105
 123106
 123107
 123108
 123109
 123110
 123111
 123112
 123113
 123114
 123115
 123116
 123117
 123118
 123119
 123120
 123121
 123122
 123123
 123124
 123125
 123126
 123127
 123128
 123129
 123130
 123131
 123132
 123133
 123134
 123135
 123136
 123137
 123138
 123139
 123140
 123141
 123142
 123143
 123144
 123145
 123146
 123147
 123148
 123149
 123150
 123151
 123152
 123153
 123154
 123155
 123156
 123157
 123158
 123159
 123160
 123161
 123162
 123163
 123164
 123165
 123166
 123167
 123168
 123169
 123170
 123171
 123172
 123173
 123174
 123175
 123176
 123177
 123178
 123179
 123180
 123181
 123182
 123183
 123184
 123185
 123186
 123187
 123188
 123189
 123190
 123191
 123192
 123193
 123194
 123195
 123196
 123197
 123198
 123199
 123200
 123201
 123202
 123203
 12

1
2
3
4
5
6
The present case is decidedly different from the case Plaintiff cited in its brief, *Center for
Biological Diversity v. U.S. Bureau of Land Management*, 422 F. Supp. 2d 1115, 1141 (N.D. Cal.
2006). In that case, the consulting agency included RPMs in the ITS but did not include terms and
conditions to implement them. *Id.* at 1141 (“The ESA provides that if an ITS contains reasonable
and prudent measures, it ‘shall’ also include terms and conditions that the agency must comply
with in order to implement the RPMs.”) (emphasis added).

7
In short, the RPM is reasonable and complies with the ESA.

8
D. NMFS Considered the Best Available Science Regarding Whale Populations

9
Plaintiff mischaracterizes the BiOp when it claims that NMFS “underestimated the pot
[gear] fishery’s harm to humpback whales in its Biological Opinion by erroneously assuming that
10 information about the CA/OR/WA stock applies to the Central America and Mexico populations.”
11 Plaintiff’s Brief, ECF 282 at 22. NMFS stated in its BiOp that the 2017 Wade study, which Plaintiff
12 relies on for its favored population estimate, estimated the abundance of the Central America and
13 Mexico DPSs to be 783 and 2,806 animals, respectively. BiOp 000111-12. However, the Wade
14 study is based on data collected from 2004-2006. BiOp 000111. NMFS noted in the BiOp that
15 “[b]ecause these estimates are >8 years old, and humpback whales in the Pacific have recently
16 experienced positive growth, they are not considered a reliable estimate of current abundance.” *Id.*
17 (citing NOAA 2016; Carretta et al. 2020). In addition, NMFS stated that “it is difficult to determine
18 the abundance” of the Central America and Mexico DPSs from the data in the agency’s own stock
assessment report, given that there are three different DPSs in the CA/OR/WA stock. *Id.*

19
After considering this information, NMFS recognized that it did “not have an analysis that
20 provides a specific estimate of the current DPS abundances and distributions.” BiOp 000113.
However, the agency “used the available information to consider several scenarios and generated
21 the most plausible estimate of the current abundance and distribution of the two listed DPSs.” *Id.*
22 Using the population and distribution estimates from the Wade study, and information from the
23 stock assessment report showing that the CA/OR/WA stock of humpback whales has been
24 increasing about 6-7 percent annually since 2006 when the Wade study was completed, NMFS
25 estimated that there are approximately 1,876 whales in the Central America DPS and 6,724 in the

1 Mexico DPS. BiOp 000111-13. This estimate is based on the best scientific information available
 2 and reflects the agency's scientific expertise, which is owed substantial deference.
 3

4 The ESA listing decision, as well as the critical habitat designation proposed and final rules
 5 that Plaintiff cites as proof that the abundance estimate in the BiOp is inconsistent with other
 6 NMFS decisions, in fact shows the opposite. *See* Plaintiff's Brief, ECF 282 at 22-23. The proposed
 7 critical habitat rule, issued a full year before the BiOp, stated only that the Central America DPS
 8 "has been most recently estimated to include 783 whales (CV = 0.170, Wade 2017)." 84 Fed. Reg.
 9 at 54,356 (Oct. 9, 2019). The final critical habitat rule, issued approximately six months after the
 10 BiOp and following the 2019 stock assessment report, stated only that the Central America DPS
 11 had "previously been estimated to include about 783 whales (CV = 0.170, Wade 2017)." 86 Fed.
 12 Reg. at 21,123 (Apr. 21, 2021). Both of these statements are true and neither contradict NMFS's
 13 conclusion made in the BiOp regarding estimates of the current population abundance. Similarly,
 14 in the ESA listing decision, NMFS stated in 2016 that it does not have "specific evidence" that the
 15 Mexico DPS is increasing. 81 Fed. Reg. at 62,306. But that statement, and ESA listing decision,
 16 was made before the stock assessment was completed, estimating that the CA/OR/WA stock is
 17 increasing 6-7 percent annually.
 18

19 While Plaintiff would certainly prefer that NMFS use population estimates from more than
 20 15 years ago and ignore studies showing that the CA/OR/WA stock of humpback whales is
 21 increasing, that is not what the ESA requires. The ESA actually requires NMFS to consider the
 22 best scientific information available when making its jeopardy determination, and that is what the
 23 agency did here. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2).

24 **III. NMFS Appropriately Relied on the BiOp**

25 Plaintiff contends that NMFS, as the action agency, erred in relying on the BiOp to
 26 authorize the fishery. *See* Plaintiff's Brief, ECF 282 at 24. As a preliminary matter, this drives
 27 home the point that Plaintiff is improperly challenging the MSA regulations outside the 30 day
 28 window required by the MSA. *See supra* at 7-9. But, in any event, where a BiOp concludes that
 29 the proposed action is not likely to jeopardize a listed species or destroy or adversely modify its
 30 critical habitat, the action agency may reasonably rely on the BiOp and proceed with the action in

1 compliance with the ESA. *Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians v. U.S. Dep’t of Navy*, 898 F.2d
 2 1410, 1415-16 (9th Cir. 1990). As the Ninth Circuit has explained, in judging an action agency’s
 3 reliance on a BiOp, the consulting agency’s “actions, or lack thereof, in preparing its opinions are
 4 relevant [] only to the extent that they demonstrate whether the [action agency’s] reliance on the
 5 reports is ‘arbitrary and capricious.’” *Id.* (citation omitted); *accord City of Tacoma v. FERC*, 460
 6 F.3d 53 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (“when we are reviewing the decision of an action agency to rely on a
 7 BiOp, the focus of our review is quite different than when we are reviewing a BiOp directly. In
 8 the former case, the critical question is whether the action agency’s reliance was arbitrary and
 9 capricious, not whether the BiOp itself is somehow flawed”). Here, Plaintiff fails to show that the
 10 BiOp is arbitrary and capricious as an initial matter. And Plaintiff has presented no evidence that
 11 NMFS (as an action agency) acted irrationally as an independent matter in accepting it. *See*
 12 Plaintiff’s Brief, ECF 282 at 24. Thus, to the extent the Court reaches the ESA claims, it should
 grant summary judgment in Federal Defendants’ favor.

13 **IV. NMFS Complied with the MMPA**

14 Changing tack, Plaintiff alleges that NMFS’s MMPA permit allowing commercial fisheries
 15 to incidentally take the CA/OR/WA humpback whale is unlawful for three reasons: (1) NMFS
 16 should have considered entanglements from all commercial fisheries, not just the sablefish pot
 17 gear fishery, when issuing its negligible impact determination; (2) NMFS violated the plain text
 18 of the MMPA when it issued the permit without having developed, or being in the process of
 19 developing, a take reduction plan for the humpback whale; and (3) in a familiar refrain, the
 20 negligible impact determination is not based on the best scientific information available because
 21 it analyzed the CA/OR/WA stock of humpback whales rather than just the Mexico and Central
 22 America DPSs.

23 As explained below, Plaintiff is wrong on all counts. NMFS took the most conservative
 24 (i.e., protective) approach possible and assumed that the total human-caused M/SI from all sources,
 25 including all commercial fisheries, was not negligible. Moreover, the MMPA does not require
 NMFS to implement a take reduction plan under development if there are insufficient funds
 available and other species are higher priority. And finally, NMFS acted reasonably when it

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
analyzed a stock, a concept that is used in the MMPA, rather than distinction population segments,
which is an ESA concept.

8
9
10
11
12
**A. NMFS Considered Human-Caused M/SI from All Sources when Making its
Negligible Impact Determination**

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
Plaintiff's assertion that the "negligible impact determination is unlawful for considering
only the level of humpback whale mortality from the [sablefish] pot [gear] fishery and not also
considering the extent of mortality from other commercial fisheries," ECF 282 at 8, rests on either
a misunderstanding, or disapproval of, a NMFS directive.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
39. Before issuing a MMPA permit for commercial fisheries to incidentally take ESA-listed
40 species, NMFS must determine that the incidental M/SI from commercial fisheries will have a
41 negligible impact⁸ on the species. 16 U.S.C. § 1371(a)(5)(E)(i). NMFS has developed a directive
42 for how to make this determination, which outlines a two-tiered approach. *See* MMPA 001219-
43 39. In the first-tier of the analysis, NMFS determines the total negligible impact threshold
44 ("NIT_T"), which represents the maximum total amount of human-caused M/SI **from all sources**
45 that NMFS considers negligible for a certain stock. MMPA 001222. NMFS then compares the
46 maximum total human-caused M/SI to NIT_T. *Id.* If the total human-caused M/SI is less than or
47 equal to NIT_T, then commercial fisheries (which are a subset of the total amount of human-caused
48 M/SI from all sources) have a negligible impact on the species. *Id.* In this situation, NMFS can
49 end its analysis and issue a negligible impact determination. *Id.* However, if the total human-
50 caused M/SI exceeds NIT_T, then NMFS moves to the second-tier analysis and determines the
51 single-fishery negligible impact threshold ("NIT_S"). *Id.* NIT_S represents the amount of M/SI
52 stemming **from a single fishery** that NMFS would consider negligible. *Id.* If the M/SI from a
53 single fishery is less than NIT_S then that fishery has a negligible impact and NMFS can issue a
54 negligible impact determination. *See id.* NMFS utilizes the two-tiered approach because the

55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
89.⁸ The MMPA does not define "negligible impact". NMFS has adopted a regulatory definition of
90 negligible impact as the term is used in other provisions of the MMPA, but not for how it is used
91 in 16 U.S.C. § 1371(a)(5)(E)(i)(I). MMPA 001220; *see* 50 C.F.R. § 216.103 (defining negligible
92 impact as "an impact resulting from the specified activity that cannot be reasonably expected to,
93 and is not reasonably likely to, adversely affect the species or stock through effects on annual rates
94 of recruitment or survival"). Nonetheless, NMFS looked at this definition when developing its
95 directive. MMPA 001219-20.

1 agency “recognizes that some stocks may experience non-negligible levels of human-caused M/SI,
 2 but one or more commercial fisheries may contribute a very small portion of that M/SI such that
 3 its individual effect is negligible and virtually undetectable.” *Id.*

4 For transboundary stocks,⁹ NMFS “cannot know for certain the M/SI that occurs outside
 5 of U.S. waters.” MMPA 001227. Therefore, NMFS takes the most conservative approach possible:
 6 the agency automatically assumes that the total amount of human-caused M/SI from all sources
 7 exceeds NIT_T and is therefore not negligible. *Id.* In these situations, NMFS proceeds to the second-
 8 tier analysis and analyzes NITs. *Id.* Because the CA/OR/WA humpback whale is a transboundary
 9 stock, NMFS followed its directive and assumed that human-caused M/SI from all sources was
 10 not negligible. MMPA 000017-23. NMFS then proceeded to the second-tier analysis, ultimately
 11 concluding that the amount of M/SI from the sablefish pot gear fishery alone (1.9) did not exceed
 12 the NITs (2.48), and was negligible. MPA 000019. NMFS issued a negligible impact determination
 13 and a incidental take permit to the sablefish pot gear fishery in 2021. MMPA 000017-23; *see also*
 MMPA 000011-14.

14 Plaintiff does not argue that NMFS failed to follow its directive or even challenge NMFS’s
 15 conclusion that the sablefish pot gear fishery itself has a negligible impact on humpback whales.
 16 *See* Plaintiff’s Brief, ECF 282 at 8. Rather, Plaintiff claims that NMFS must “consider[] the deaths
 17 from all commercial fisheries before allowing any individual fishery to kill an endangered marine
 18 mammal.” *Id.* at 9. But Plaintiff fails to recognize that NMFS did so. As discussed above, because
 19 the CA/OR/WA humpback whale stock is transboundary, NMFS assumed that the M/SI from all
 20 sources, including all commercial fisheries, was non-negligible. That is the most conservative and
 21 protective approach that NMFS can take given that the agency cannot know for certain what M/SI
 22 is occurring outside U.S. waters. Notably, Plaintiff has identified no alternative method NMFS
 23 should have used to make a negligible impact determination given the transboundary nature of
 humpback whales and the unreliability of data outside United States’ waters.¹⁰ *See generally*

24 ⁹ Transboundary stocks are those stocks that migrate into and out of the United States’ waters.

25 ¹⁰ To the extent Plaintiff is attempting to argue that the directive itself is unlawful, it did not
 challenge the directive in its complaint and cannot do so now. *See* Complaint, ECF 1; *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (a plaintiff is “require[d]” to plead a “short and plain

1 Plaintiff's Brief, ECF 282.

2

3 Similarly, Plaintiff argues that because NMFS considered M/SI from all fisheries in
 4 previous negligible impact determinations, including a past determination for the sablefish pot gear
 5 fishery, NMFS should have done the same here. Plaintiff's Brief, ECF 282 at 10-11. But, once
 6 again, Plaintiff's argument is a moot point: NMFS considered M/SI from all sources in this
 7 determination, just like it did in previous determinations. It is how, not whether, NMFS considered
 8 the M/SI from all sources that has changed. Rather than attempting to precisely calculate all
 9 sources of M/SI as it did previously, NMFS now assumes for transboundary stocks that the M/SI
 10 from all sources was not negligible. MMPA 001227. And, even where NMFS's directive is
 11 different from its previous practice, the directive acknowledges that NMFS had previously used
 12 different criteria to evaluate negligible impact, described why these criteria "proved problematic",
 13 established a new policy for evaluating negligible impact, and explained why this directive
 14 provides a more rational approach—all of the necessary requirements for a change in agency
 15 position. *See Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Haaland*, 998 F.3d 1061, 1067 (9th Cir. 2021).

16 In a variation on the same theme, Plaintiff contends that the MMPA requires NMFS to
 17 determine that "the incidental mortality and serious injury from commercial fisheries", rather than
 18 a single fishery, will have a negligible impact on the stock. Plaintiff's Brief, ECF 282 at 9. Plaintiff
 19 suggests that all commercial fisheries in total must have a negligible impact on a stock, before a
 20 negligible impact determination can be issued. *See id.* But this is a non-sequitur. NMFS did
 21 consider M/SI from all fisheries. But putting that aside, as Plaintiff admits, Congress' use of a
 22 plural ("fisheries") can include the singular ("fishery"). *See* 1 U.S.C. § 1 ("In determining the
 23 meaning of any Act of Congress, unless the context indicates otherwise—. . . words importing the
 24 plural include the singular"); *Life Techs. Corp. v. Promega Corp.*, 580 U.S. 140, 151 (2017);
 25 Plaintiff's Brief, ECF 282 at 9. Moreover, when looking at the statute, it is apparent that "fisheries"

26 statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, in order to give the defendant
 27 fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests"); Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2).
 28 Moreover, any challenge to the directive would not succeed, particularly given the deference it is
 29 due under *Skidmore v. Swift & Co.*, 323 U.S. 134, 140 (1944).

1 could include a single “fishery”. For example, 16 U.S.C. § 1371(a)(5)(E)(ii), states that “[u]pon a
 2 determination by the Secretary that the requirements of clause (i) have been met, the Secretary
 3 shall publish in the Federal Register a list of those fisheries for which such determination was
 4 made.” It would be unnecessary for the Secretary to make a “list of those fisheries” for which a
 5 negligible impact determination is made if the Secretary had to make a determination that every
 6 commercial fishery, in total, will have a negligible impact on a stock. Furthermore, Plaintiff’s
 7 reading of the statute would mean that NMFS would need to analyze the exact M/SI from all
 8 commercial fisheries, which is not feasible for transboundary stocks. MMPA 001228.

9 Plaintiff’s reliance on the statutory purpose of the MMPA and legislative history does not
 10 support its reading either. The MMPA recognizes that marine mammals “may be taken incidentally
 11 in the course of commercial fishing operations” and establishes a process for obtaining an
 12 incidental take permit. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 1361(a)(2); *id.* § 1387. Therefore, while the “immediate
 13 goal” of the MMPA is that incidental take of marine mammals “be reduced to insignificant levels
 14 approaching a zero mortality and serious injury rate”, it still permits incidental take to occur
 15 provided there will be a negligible impact on the stock and other requirements are met. *See id.* §
 16 1361(a)(2); *id.* § 1387(a)(1). By concluding that the sablefish pot gear fishery has a negligible
 17 impact, and analyzing in the future whether other commercial fisheries have a negligible impact
 18 on humpback whales, NMFS is meeting the “immediate goal” of the MMPA.

19 Moreover, the congressional committee report stating that the Committee believes the
 20 “negligible impact” standard in the MMPA is more stringent than the ESA “no jeopardy” standard,
 21 shows only that. *See* Plaintiff’s Brief, ECF 282 at 10 (citing H.R. Rep. No. 103-439 at 30). As
 22 noted previously, Congress did not define “negligible impact” in the MMPA and neither has
 23 NMFS defined the term as used in 16 U.S.C. § 1371(a)(5)(E)(i). *See supra* n.8. But even assuming
 24 that the negligible impact is a more stringent standard than the ESA jeopardy standard and ESA
 25 case law applies here, NMFS did indeed consider the totality of impacts from commercial fisheries
 in conducting a negligible impact determination. *See supra* at 19.

26 In sum, Plaintiff’s argument that NMFS did not consider all sources of M/SI when making
 27 its negligible impact determination for humpback whales lacks merit. Plaintiff’s argument is not

1 supported by the MMPA, legislative history, or previous agency determinations. NMFS's
 2 determination was reasonable and should be upheld.

3 **B. NMFS is Not Required to Implement a Take Reduction Plan if there is
 4 Insufficient Funding Available**

5 Relying on 16 U.S.C. § 1371(a)(5)(E)(i), Plaintiff next contends that NMFS was legally
 6 required to develop, or be developing, a take reduction plan for humpback whales prior to issuing
 7 its MMPA permit to the sablefish pot gear fishery. Plaintiff's Brief, ECF 282 at 12-14. Plaintiff
 8 argues at length that the agency's failure to do so "violates the plain language of the MMPA" and
 9 renders the MMPA permit invalid. *Id.* But it is Plaintiff that did not consider the plain language of
 10 the MMPA, which expressly contemplates that NMFS may not be able to implement a take
 11 reduction plan under development prior to issuing a permit if there is insufficient funding available.
 12 16 U.S.C. § 1387(f)(3). "If there is insufficient funding available to develop and implement a take
 13 reduction plan for all such stocks that interact with commercial fisheries listed under subsection
 14 (c)(1)(A) (i) or (ii), the Secretary shall give highest priority to the development and implementation
 15 of take reduction plans for species or stocks": (1) whose level of incidental mortality and serious
 16 injury exceeds the PBR; (2) has a small population size; and (3) that is declining most rapidly. *Id.*¹¹
 17 This provision allows NMFS to set priorities for developing take reduction plans and "not develop
 18 a reduction plan at all if there is insufficient funds." *Hui Kohola I Kohola v. NMFS*, 669 F. Supp.
 19 2d 1182, 1191 (D. Haw. 2009); *see also Strahan v. Linnon*, 967 F. Supp. 581, 590 n.9 (D. Mass.
 20 1997) (noting that Plaintiff's claim that NMFS did not implement a take reduction plan under
 21 development would fail because of the "great degree of flexibility afforded to" NMFS to set
 22 priorities).

23 Here, NMFS deferred implementation of a take reduction plan for the CA/OR/WA stock

24

 25 ¹¹ It is not clear why Plaintiff did not address this provision of the MMPA when submitting its
 opening brief to the Court. Plaintiff submitted comments on NMFS's proposed rule to issue the
 MMPA permit on this very issue, asserting that the agency had not developed, and was not in the
 process of developing, the take reduction plan. *See* 86 Fed. Reg. at 69,631. NMFS responded to
 Plaintiff's comment by identifying this provision and explaining that it applied in this instance.
See id. Moreover, Plaintiff cited to NMFS's priority list for establishing take reduction teams that
 develop take reduction plans. Plaintiff's Brief, ECF 282 at 13. This demonstrates that Plaintiff
 presumably had knowledge of the statutory provision that allows NMFS to create such a list.

1 of humpback whales for the reasons identified in the statute: there is insufficient funding available
 2 to implement a take reduction plan for all applicable stocks and there are higher priority stocks. 86
 3 Fed. Reg. at 69,629, 69,631; MMPA 000012. In the priority list of take reduction teams under
 4 development, NMFS concluded that there are higher priority stocks because of the “low levels of
 5 M/SI incidental to commercial fishing compared to other marine mammal stocks and commercial
 6 fisheries.” 86 Fed. Reg. at 69,631; *see* ER 000668 (NMFS’s priority list for establishing take
 7 reduction teams that develop take reduction plans). NMFS’s conclusion is bolstered by the best
 8 scientific information available, which shows that a conservative estimate of the number of
 9 CA/OR/WA humpback whales is 4,776 and the population is increasing 6-7 percent annually.
 BiOp 000107-08.

10 Plaintiff did not allege in its complaint that NMFS had sufficient funding to develop a take
 11 reduction plan for the humpback whale prior to issuing the MMPA permit. *See* Complaint, ECF 1.
 12 Nor did Plaintiff allege that the agency’s priority list is inaccurate or unlawful. *See id.* Therefore,
 13 Plaintiff cannot now argue these points. *See id.*; *Newton v. American Debit Services, Inc.*, 75 F.
 14 Supp. 3d 1048, 1063 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (“As the Ninth Circuit has repeatedly held, ‘summary
 15 judgment is not a procedural second chance to flesh out inadequate pleadings.’”) (citations
 16 omitted). However, should the Court allow Plaintiff to raise these arguments, NMFS is prepared
 17 to provide further evidence to the Court regarding its insufficient funding for implementing take
 18 reduction plans under development and its competing priorities. *See Lands Council v. Powell*, 395
 19 F.3d 1019, 1030 (9th Cir. 2005) (allowing extra-record documents if necessary to show if the
 agency has considered all relevant factors and adequately explained its decision).

20 **C. NMFS Reasonably Analyzed the CA/OR/WA Stock of Humpback Whales in
 21 its Negligible Impact Determination**

22 Finally, Plaintiff contends that NMFS did not use the best available science when making
 23 its negligible impact determination because NMFS analyzed the CA/OR/WA stock, rather than the
 24 two ESA-listed DPSs of humpback whales. Plaintiff’s Brief, ECF 28 at 20-21. But Plaintiff is
 25 improperly conflating the MMPA and ESA.

Pursuant to the ESA, NMFS can list, manage, and conserve species, subspecies, or DPSs of a species. However, under the MMPA, NMFS manages stocks: “a group of marine mammals

1 of the same species or smaller taxa in a common spatial arrangement, that interbreed when
 2 mature.” 16 U.S.C. § 1362(11). “A marine mammal ‘population stock’ or ‘stock’ is the
 3 fundamental unit of conservation under the” MMPA. MMPA 001240. While the animals in a
 4 particular MMPA stock are frequently the same as those animals listed as a species, subspecies, or
 5 DPS under the ESA, that is not always the case. The CA/OR/WA humpback whale stock comprises
 6 whales from the ESA-listed endangered Central America and threatened Mexico DPSs. 86 Fed.
 7 Reg. at 69,630-31. But it also includes the unlisted Hawaii DPS. *Id.* at 69,631.

8 The current misalignment stems from the 2016 decision to revise the ESA listing of the
 9 humpback whale species into 14 DPSs. *Id.* NMFS is in the process of revising humpback whale
 10 stock structure under the MMPA pursuant to its Procedural Directive 02-204-03: Reviewing and
 11 Designating Stocks and Issuing Stock Assessment Reports (MMPA 001240-48). *Id.* But in the
 12 interim, nothing requires NMFS to segment out the ESA-listed humpback whales in the stock from
 13 the non-ESA listed whales. In fact, doing so would be at odds with the plain language of the
 14 MMPA which requires NMFS to manage “stocks.” *See, e.g.*, 16 U.S.C. § 1836(a) (requiring NMFS
 15 to prepare a stock assessment report “for each marine mammal stock which occurs in waters under
 16 the jurisdiction of the United States”).¹² NMFS cannot simply decide to only consider some
 17 humpback whales in the currently designated stock when making determinations, including a
 18 negligible impact determination. NMFS designated the CA/OR/WA stock as a stock in 1995 and
 19 is required to use this MMPA identified stock until NMFS revises it pursuant to its directive.
 20 Therefore, it was reasonable for NMFS to conclude that it would continue managing humpback
 21 whales on the west coast as the CA/OR/WA stock because it “cannot manage one portion of an
 22 MMPA stock as ESA-listed and another portion of a stock as not ESA-listed.” 86 Fed. Reg. 58,641
 23 (Oct. 22, 2021). And, contrary to Plaintiff’s argument (ECF 282 at 21), NMFS’s decision to
 24 examine the CA/OR/WA stock as a whole rather than using the ESA DPSs is **more** protective for
 25 humpback whales. Right now, the Hawaii DPS is receiving MMPA protections that it would not
 otherwise be entitled to if the stock structure was changed to align with the DPSs.

¹² NMFS relies on stock assessment reports when making decisions, including the negligible impact determination at issue here. *See* MMPA 000012.

1
2 In sum, NMFS's decision to issue the permit is reasonable and based on the plain language
3 of the MMPA.

4 **V. No Remedy is Necessary**

5 Plaintiff has not shown that its request for relief can be, or should be, granted. However, if
6 the Court rules for Plaintiff, Federal Defendants request the opportunity to provide separate
7 briefing on remedy. Plaintiff requests vacatur of the BiOp and MMPA permit. Proposed Order,
8 ECF 282-4. But even if the Court rules for Plaintiff on any of its claims, vacatur would not
9 automatically follow because the Court is not required to set aside every unlawful agency action.
10 *See Idaho Farm Bureau Fed'n v. Babbitt*, 58 F.3d 1392, 1405 (9th Cir. 1995) (stating that "when
11 equity demands" a court can leave an unlawful regulation in place while the agency follows the
12 necessary procedures). The Ninth Circuit has provided two factors courts weigh when deciding
13 whether to remand to an agency without vacatur: (1) how serious the agency's errors are; and (2)
14 the disruptive consequences of an interim change that may itself be changed. *Cal. Cmtys. Against
15 Toxics v. EPA*, 688 F.3d 989, 992 (9th Cir. 2012). Because the arguments on these two factors will
16 depend on the Court's ruling and activity on the ground at the time of any such ruling, Federal
17 Defendants cannot adequately address the factors at this time. If the Court rules in Plaintiff's favor
18 on any of its claims, Federal Defendants request an opportunity to brief these two factors in light
19 of any errors identified by the Court.

20 **CONCLUSION**

21 For these reasons, Federal Defendants' motion for summary judgment should be granted
22 and Plaintiff's motion should be denied.

23 Dated: August 25, 2022

24 Respectfully submitted,

25
26 TODD KIM, Assistant Attorney General
27 S. JAY GOVINDAN, Acting Chief
28 MEREDITH L. FLAX, Assistant Chief

29
30 /s/ Kaitlyn Poirier
31 KAITLYN POIRIER, Trial Attorney

1 U.S. Department of Justice
2 Environment and Natural Resources Division
3 Wildlife and Marine Resources Section
4 Ben Franklin Station, P.O. Box 7611
5 Washington, D.C. 20044-7611
(202) 307-6623 (tel)
(202) 305-0275 (fax)
kaitlyn.poirier@usdoj.gov

6 Attorneys for Federal Defendants
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25